



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Byzantine collections and anthologies of poetry

Citation for published version:

Spingou, F 2019, Byzantine collections and anthologies of poetry. in W Hörandner, A Rhoby & N Zagklas (eds), *A Companion to Byzantine Poetry*. Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World, vol. 4, Brill, Leiden; Boston, pp. 381-403. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004392885_017

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1163/9789004392885_017](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004392885_017)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

A Companion to Byzantine Poetry

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



PRE-PUBLICATION MANUSCRIPT

TITLE: Byzantine Collections and Anthologies of Poetry

NAME: Foteini Spingou

ABSTRACT:

While offering an overview of Byzantine compilations of poetry, this paper argues for their role as autonomous literary works situated in different sociocultural contexts and emphasizes their significance for the transmission of the texts. It distinguishes anthologies from collections having as a criterion the number of authors represented in a compilation. Collections are divided into two categories on the basis of the compiler's identity -- the poet himself or an admirer of his work. It further proposes to differentiate "Classicizing" and "Byzantine" Anthologies, on the basis of their content. The Greek Anthology and the related to it anthologies are understood as "Classicizing"; while anthologies of occasional poetry are classified as "Byzantine". It argues that authorship was important for compilers only if they wished to emphasize the importance of a text. Finally, it is suggested that these compilations represent a group of aesthetic values which can be considered "canonical".

KEYWORDS:

DISCIPLINE CATEGORIES

- 8. Archives and Sources
- 13. Byzantine world
- 38. Learning
- 40. Literature – General
- 42. Literature – Verse
- 45. Manuscripts and Palaeography

GEOGRAPHICAL CATEGORIES

- 6. Eastern Mediterranean
- 10. Italy (with Malta and Ticino)

CHRONOLOGICAL CATEGORIES

- 5. 9th century
- 6. 10th century
- 7. 11th century
- 8. 12th century
- 9. 13th century
- 10. 14th century

OTHER KEYWORDS

- 1. Anthologies
- 2. Collections
- 3. Literary Canon
- 4. Authorship

BYZANTINE COLLECTIONS AND ANTHOLOGIES OF POETRY

*Nel suo profondo vidi che s'interna,
legato con amore in un volume,
ciò che per l'universo si squaderna...*

*In its profundity I saw when entering
bound by love in a single volume
these which are scattered leaves throughout the universe...*

Dante, *La Divina Commedia: Paradiso*, 33. 85 – 87

Definitions

When Sir Henry Wellcome, founder of the Wellcome Trust and perhaps the greatest collector of the past century, started amassing his collection, he intended to demonstrate “by means of objects...every notable step in the evolution and progress from the first germ of life up to the fully developed man of today.”¹ The unique artworks and objects, once in 1,300 cases in his storage area, are now housed in famous (mostly Londonese) museums, available to the modern visitor for experiencing fragments of the past. Byzantine collectors of poetry are not different from Sir Wellcome in what they have to offer and their aims. Their collections and anthologies are the major source for Byzantine poetry for the modern reader; and, indeed, they demonstrate past or contemporary literary achievements by means of texts. As it is not always clear what led Sir Wellcome (or his agents) to acquire an object, similarly it is uncertain why a Byzantine collector included a poem in his compilation. The lack of a clear statement over his criteria poses a problem in defining the right descriptive terms for these complications. So what is a poetic collection and an anthology?

Modern definitions of the terms “poetic collection” and “anthology” lack accuracy. Both terms are applied to forms of compilations because they include poems, which are decontextualized and thus disconnected from previous interpretive frames, such as an object or a ceremony. A poetic collection is considered to include poems with

¹ See Fr. Larson, *An Infinity of Things: How Sir Henry Wellcome Collected the World*, Oxford 2009, esp. p. 152. Full quote in Bibliography Section

“a sequential or other holistic form”²; while an anthology is understood to be a “bouquet” of poems, masterpieces which do not necessarily narrate *one* story³. The very fact that poems are considered “interesting” or “beautiful” and thus worthy to be included in a compilation, imposes the holistic aspect of collections to anthologies as well. Poems are assembled to tell the story of, e.g., a literary “genre” or of good writing or even to give instructions to the good Christian. To put it differently, an anthology is a collection even if the criteria for its compilation are not explicit. Let us take for example the case of the ultimate anthology, the *Palatine Anthology*, which is a middle Byzantine compilation and combines earlier poetic anthologies and collections. Despite the constant additions, the compilation has an internal sequence. This sequence has started to be decoded only very recently⁴. At the same time, a compilation of poems penned by one author could also be considered an anthology. Although it has a “holistic form” as the work of one author, such a compilation is neither always arranged in an obviously rational manner nor possesses a “sequential” form. Often it includes only a “bouquet” of poems by one and the same author. Collectors refer to their collections as such. In a famous passage, the eleventh-century poet John Mauropous sets his collection’s goal to give “a small (little?) taste” of his literary production (see below). And a thirteenth-century copyist indicates that what follows in another manuscript are “various verses” from the pen of Mitylenaios “selected and placed” in that manuscript⁵.

As confusion can arise from describing medieval practices with modern terms, I would rather follow Marc Lauxtermann, who keeps things simple, dividing roughly the available manuscript material into “collections of poems by a single author and anthologies containing poems by various authors”⁶. The term “sylloge” is often used in modern scholarship to denote small anthologies. Despite the functional character of such a definition, the dividing line remains blurred, as the lack of Byzantine interest in the question of authorship resulted in poems of various authors “sneaking in” to an authored

² E<arl> M<inner>, ‘Collections, Poetic’, in A. Preminger and T.V.F. Brogan, *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, Princeton N.J. 1993, pp. 222–23.

³ T.V.F. Brogan and R.A. Swanson, “Anthology”, *ibid.*, pp. 74–76.

⁴ Al. Cameron, *The Greek Anthology*; Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, pp. 83–123; Lauxtermann, “Cephalas”; Maltomini, “Selezione e organizzazione”.

⁵ Vat. gr. 1357 (XIV s.), fol. 82: “Χριστοφόρου...τοῦ μιτυληναίου στίχοι διάφοροι ἐκλεγέντες καὶ τεθέντες ἐνθάδε”. See de Groote, *Mitylenaios*, p. XLVII.

⁶ Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, p. 61.

collection. Justly, Paolo Odorico refers to the Byzantine collecting impulse as “la cultura della Sylloge” or “la culture du recueil,” which perhaps can be rendered in English as the “culture of the compilation.”⁷ For Odorico, “Sylloge” or “Recueil” describes the way medieval speakers of Greek worked to compile excerpts or full texts in manuscripts⁸.

Nonetheless, the difficulty in terminology also reflects a reality: each compilation of poetry must be treated as a unique cultural product. However, a list of seeming similarities of anthologies or collections of a certain era can be compiled. Collections and anthologies of poetry obviously depend on the production of poetry itself. As little poetry was produced during the “dark ages” in Byzantium, collections started appearing after the end of iconoclasm⁹. Then, as the interest for the production of occasional poetry declined after the 1330s, anthologies with the “typically” Byzantine occasional poetry become a rarity after 1350s, without, however, ceasing to exist altogether.

Collections of Byzantine Poetry

Two groups of poetic collections can be distinguished: those that were gathered by the author himself and those that were compiled by students or admirers of an author. However, if a compiler’s note (often a book epigram) is not included, any secure classification is impossible. Titles of poems are rarely helpful since in most cases the poems come from the draftbooks of authors.

One of the first poetic collections to appear after iconoclasm was that of the poetic oeuvre of the preceding era’s greatest holy man, Theodore the Stoudite. Seventy years after his death, Theodore’s cult led Dionysios, a monk of the Stoudite monastery, to register verse inscriptions attributed to Theodore from the walls of the monastery and other Stoudite monasteries. Dionysios added to his compilation other poems that he found in manuscripts and thus he created the collection of Theodore Stoudite’s poetry¹⁰. In a poem appended at the end of the collection and in painstaking hexameters, Dionysios

⁷ Instead of “the florilegic habit” as tentatively suggested by Paul Magdalino (“Orthodoxy and History”, p. 143).

⁸ Odorico, “La cultura della Συλλογή”; idem “La culture du recueil”.

⁹ Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, p. 67.

¹⁰ On the poetic collection of Theodore the Stoudite see Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, pp. 70–72 (and Speck???) and Demoen’s paper in the present volume.

expresses his admiration, but also implicitly claims credit for the collection by the poem's very presence¹¹.

Almost a century later, Niketas Stethatos published the collected poetic work of another holy man, Symeon the New Theologian. Niketas speaks of his agency in more vivid terms than Dionysios, referring to it twice: first, in a *Vita* that he composed for Symeon, and second, at the introduction that he placed before the poetic collection. Thirteen years after the death of the great mystic Symeon – that is, in 1035 – Niketas collected the latter's work. Symeon's poetic work occupied a special place in Niketas enterprise, as according to the available manuscript evidence and the introduction preceding the poetic collection, and despite Niketas' claims in the *Vita*, the hymns circulated independently of Symeon's prose works¹². Moreover, Niketas felt responsible for the collection of Symeon's works that he assembled by divine command. According to the *Vita*, after Symeon's decease, Niketas had a vision, which was interpreted by "a very wise elder", that Symeon invited Niketas to "write down" ("γράφῃ") "the compositions [of Symeon] that were provided to him [Symeon] by the Spirit from above"; so that Niketas would make them "known to the faithful" and "they [the compositions] may benefit those who read them"¹³. The use of the undoubtedly ambivalent verb "γράφω" (to write) is particularly curious and especially since this is the first time that Niketas speaks about his "mission". In later passages, Niketas refers to his undertaking with the words "μεταγραφῇ" and "μεταγράψαι", or "μετάπηξις" and "μεταπηγνόναι", indicating that he simply copied the words of Symeon¹⁴. These later terms would have been most appropriate to describe Niketas' undertaking, given that Symeon himself wrote down his mystical experiences and that Niketas alleges he worked from the saint's manuscripts¹⁵. However, when the verb "γράφω" reappears a few paragraphs after the passage in question, it has the meaning "to compose", referring to Niketas' encomia to Symeon¹⁶. Hence, by using the verb "γράφω" in a crucial passage for

¹¹ Theodore the Stoudite, *Iambs*, no. 124. See also Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, pp. 72–73.

¹² See J. Koder, *Syméon le Nouveau Théologien, Hymnes*, vol. 1, SC 156, Paris 1968, pp. 23–25; and A. Kambylis, *Symeon Neos Theologos : Hymnen*, Suppl. Byz. 3, Berlin/New York 1976, pp. XLII – XLVII, LXXXVII – LXXXI, LXXXIX – XCVI.

¹³ Chapter 139, cf. Greenfield, *Niketas*, p. 343.

¹⁴ Chapter 150, cf. Greenfield, *Niketas*, p. 379–81.

¹⁵ Chapters 131 and 140, transl. Greenfield, *Symeon*, pp. 317 and 345.

¹⁶ Chapter 148, cf. Greenfield, *Niketas*, p. 371.

the development of the narrative, Niketas claims co-responsability for the final form of Symeon's collected works. Such a feeling of co-responsibility is also mirrored in the way he intervenes in Symeon's poems. The very title of the compilation is his invention : “τῶν θεῶν ἐρώτων ὕμνοι” (*Hymns of the Divine Loves*) – although none of the fifty-eight poems can be interpreted as a hymn. He also added a general introduction at the beginning of each “hymn”¹⁷, and modern research has shown that indeed Niketas intervened in the very text¹⁸. Therefore, Niketas was neither a simple compiler nor a new gatekeeper for the treasure of Symeon's work¹⁹. Instead he is a collector who labels the poetry – as if guiding the reader around the texts – and who is interested in presenting literary artifacts in a manner accessible to the beholder.

Niketas himself states that his aim for “making his [Symeon's] legacy known everywhere and [...] publishing his divine writings for everyone” is to make sure “that they are readily available to help and benefit their [the people's] souls”²⁰. By publishing Symeon's hymns, Niketas diffuses the word of a holy man, who was given revelations by the Holy Spirit²¹. Most importantly, and since the circulation of Symeon's works is uncertain, Niketas preserves Symeon's works. Niketas did this for the first time in Symeon's lifetime. According to the *Vita*, Niketas was entrusted to copy Symeon's works, but he returned to Symeon both copy and original²². More than a decade after Symeon's death, Niketas not only claims that he had no access to manuscripts with Symeon's works until “accidentally” (or by divine providence) they came into his

¹⁷ The labeling of the poems by Niketas as “hymns” is misleading. As J. Koder has discussed the genre of these poetic texts is a hybrid, including features of lyric and didactic poetry, verse homily and having strong autobiographical elements. Koder, “Ο Συμεών...και οι ὕμνοι του”, pp. 25–26. You may add E. Afentoulidou-Leitgeb, Οι ὕμνοι του Συμεών του Νέου Θεολόγου. Σχέσεις των επιγραφών με τους Ὑμνους, *Byzantina* 22 (2001) 123–147

¹⁸ Koder, “Ο Συμεών ... και οι ὕμνοι του”, p. 8. See also M. Lauxtermann review of A. Markopoulos (ed.), *Τέσσερα κείμενα για την ποίηση του Συμεών του Νέου Θεολόγου* (Athens, 2008), in *Byzantina Symmeikta* 19 (2009) pp. 291–297, esp. pp. 291–292.

¹⁹ Greenfield, *Symeon*, p. ix – x, argues that Niketas presents himself as Symeon's “deliberately chosen literary trustee”. Symeon indeed entrusted him to make known his legacy, however, according to Chapter 140 of the *vita*, a process of collection was intervened. Niketas says that Symeon's compositions “had been taken and guarded like some royal treasure for thirteen years by another difficult man”... “and one book of his compositions that had been sold off”. All these works came together to Niketas' hands, who published the collected work of Symeon (not only the *Hymns*, which concerns us here). See also Chapters 133–135.

²⁰ Chapter 140, transl. Greenfield, *Symeon*, p. 345. Cf. Symeon's Letter that Niketas includes in the *vita*, Chapter 132, Greenfield, *Symeon*, pp. 319 – 321.

²¹ Chapter 131, transl. Greenfield, *Symeon*, p. 317.

²² With the exception of some letters addressed to Niketas. See Chapter 131, Greenfield, *Symeon*, p. 319.

possession; but also he speaks of a book that was sold off and he managed to find. These manuscripts were more than sixteen years old by the time Niketas wrote, and it is not beyond imagination that Symeon's works were in eminent danger of disappearing, if indeed only a single copy existed.

The case of Niketas' self-awareness as a collector finds a parallel in that of Dionysios. Dionysios is present in the collection thanks to his book epigram and the very fact that he recorded the epigrams. Niketas is present with the interventions to the text, the introduction and the briefing at the beginning of each poem. Moreover, they both record and ensure the survival of divinely inspired words. In this sense their collections are not "antiquarian" actions or collections of curiosities, but practical guidance for a good Christian life. The circulation of their collections would also benefit themselves. Niketas was trying to establish Symeon's cult, at the time that he (Niketas) was involved in political turbulences. Dionysios with his collection ensured that the memory of the spiritual founder of his monastery remained alive. The potential circulation of his collection would also mean that some of the verses could become verse inscriptions in monasteries outside the Stoudite circle, and thus could ensure the further spreading of Theodore's teachings.

From the middle of the eleventh century on, an increasing number of authors were interested in collecting their works. Unfortunately, only a few of these collections have come down to our modern era. Sometimes we are lucky enough to hear about them. Isaac Komnenos, son of an emperor, wished to bequeath the collection of his writings ("heroic, iambic and political verse, as well as various letters and *ekphraseis*") to the monastery he founded, the Theotokos Kosmosoteira in Thrace, near Pherrai. He demands that the book not "lie in an obscure place, but be displayed often as [something to] read (and in memory of me) to those especially industrious men (and they [are the ones who] want to come upon books and pictures)"²³. And he is not slow to add that he does not wish the books that he bequeathed (including his collected works) "to be alienated by the monastery" but "to survive" there "forever". Unfortunately, Isaac's book did not survive

²³ Transl. N. Patterson Ševčenko, 'Kosmosoteira: *Typikon* of the sebastokrator Isaac Komnenos for the monastery of the Mother of God *Kosmosoteira* near Bera', in *BMFD*, no. 29, p. 844, par. 106. Please, cite *BMFD* in full. The entire quote has to go to the Bibliography Section (this applies to all references in the footnotes!)

the vicissitudes of the Pherrai monastery. However, the book of the collected works of John Mauropous, the highly erudite metropolitan of Euchaita and a prolific teacher of the eleventh century, is now at the Vatican library (ms. Vat. gr. 676).

The Vatican manuscript has long been thought a close copy of the original collection by Mauropous. Recently, Daniele Bianconi proved on palaeographical grounds that the Vaticanus is the original and that Mauropous himself oversaw the production of the book²⁴. According to the book epigram at the beginning of his volume, he carefully included his rhetorical works (in prose and verse) in order to give a “small (little?) taste” (“γεῦμα μικρόν”) from “a rich scent of flowers” (“δαψιλοὺς ἀνθοσμίου”) to the friends of literature (“τοῖς λόγων φίλοις”)²⁵. Mauropous, like Isaac, collected his works to be read by a small circle closely affiliated to the author. Mauropous had students and he was part of the most vibrant circle of *literati* of his age. Isaac, a nobleman, did not have real students, but the monks of the monastery that he founded could become such “students”.

In the book epigram, Mauropous indicates that the poetic section of Vat. gr. 676 was formed after a deliberate process of selection and subsequent arrangement so that the reader would receive “a moderate pleasure”. According to Floris Bernard, Mauropous was interested in constructing a self-representative image in the way he arranged the poetry. Mauropous – still according to Bernard – appears in different sections of the collection as “a humble epigrammatist”, as a “man self-assertive about his authorship” and with “high-ranking friends” and so forth²⁶.

The case of Mauropous’ book is unique. We have never come as close to a medieval author’s practice in preserving his own poetry as this one. In most cases, it is unclear who arranged the poetry as it survives. Revealing is the case of another eleventh-century master, that of Christopher Mitylenaios. Mitylenaios’ poetic collection has been (poorly) preserved in a manuscript in Grottaferrata (Z a XXIX), which was copied far away from where Mitylenaios lived and flourished, in the thirteenth-century Terra d’Otranto²⁷. It has been suggested that the collection is arranged chronologically,

²⁴ “ ‘Piccolo assaggio di abbondante fraganza’. Giovanni Mauropode e il Vat. gr. 676”, *JÖB* 61, 2011, pp. 89 – 103.

²⁵ Poem 1, vv. 26–29.

²⁶ Bernard, *Writing and Reading*, pp. 136–148.

²⁷ For the relevant bibliography see M. de Groote, *Mitylenaios*, pp. xxvii–xxix, and Arnesiano, *La minuscola*, no. 88 (p. 97).

although some poems are grouped around the same subject²⁸. Given that Mitylenaios' poems are arranged chronologically, it is a plausible hypothesis that the poems come from a register with his works²⁹. However, whether this "register" was formed by Mitylenaios himself or a copyist who selected some poems from a larger pool remains uncertain.

The problems encountered when trying to identify the collector can be further demonstrated by looking into the poetic collection of the late twelfth-century canonist Theodore Balsamon. Balsamon's collection is transmitted as part of an extensive poetic anthology, the *Anthologia Marciana* (see below)³⁰. It is not possible to discern a pattern of arrangement to the poetry within the collection. Only a group of epigrams at the beginning of the collection stands out as a cluster (nos. 1 – 8)³¹. Otherwise, poems on the same subject appear separately in the collection³². Most importantly, three more epigrams attributed to Balsamon (excluded from the collection) are copied by the same scribe and compiler of the anthology later on in the same anthology³³, indicating that he had access to a larger corpus of epigrams. Is the modern reader approaching Balsamon through the author's selection of poems or that of a later compiler?

Nicholas Kallikles' collection, also part of the *Anthologia Marciana*, can provide some interesting clues. In the original arrangement of the manuscript's quires, Kallikles' collection was the opening poetic section of the anthology. His collection as it appears in the Marcianus comprises twenty-five poems³⁴ with two easily distinguishable parts: the first twenty-one poems at least are verse inscriptions (or at least they are intended as such), while the rest have a performative function³⁵. Furthermore, smaller clusters also

²⁸ Bernard, *Reading and Writing Poetry*, pp. 148–53. Crimi, *Canzoniere*, pp. 16–20, suggests that the collection's focus is diverting from the court towards an intimate group of friends, as also the metre becomes simpler.

²⁹ Cf. N. Oikonomides, 'Life and Society in Eleventh-century Constantinople', *Südost-Forschungen* 49, 1990, 2.

³⁰ Marc. gr. 524, fols. 89 – 96; cf. Horna, "Die Epigramme", pp. 178–199; nos. 1–39.

³¹ Horna, "Die Epigramme", p. 204.

³² E.g. Horna, "Die Epigramme", nos. 21–23 cf. no. 25 or no. 9 cf. nos. 35 – 37.

³³ Fols. 8^v–9.

³⁴ The arrangement of the poems is the following (using Romano's numbering): 1, 2, 32, 3, 4, 8, 11, 13 – 18, 20 – 31. Romano has placed no. 32 among the "dubia", because in other manuscripts it is attributed to poets other than Kallikles. Romano himself seems to be uncertain about his decision (Romano, *Kallikles*, p. 29).

³⁵ Romano's no. 28, which is included in the Marcianus, could be either a verse inscription or a sepulchral epigram.

exist within the collection: poems 18 to 22 (according to Romano's numbering) are tomb epigrams and poems 24 to 25 are dedicated to monumental pictorial works in the palace³⁶. In other words, Kallikles' collection is arranged according to the medieval concept of "genre" – which is closer to the modern notions of "subject-matter" and function than to literary "genre". However, Kallikles' collection in the *Anthologia Marciana* does not include all the poems penned by the author or even all the inscriptional epigrams³⁷. Thus, it can be assumed that what is included in the *Anthologia Marciana* is only a fraction of a larger poetic collection purposely arranged and coming from the author's papers³⁸. From this fraction the scribe was able to make further selections. The scribe-redactor was the one deciding what to include. Three of Kallikles' poems re-appear in a different part of the anthology indicating a selection process on the part of the scribe. Therefore, it is highly probable – although hard to prove – that Balsamon's collection stems from a similar selection process since it is also preserved as part of the *Anthologia Marciana*.

Poetic Anthologies

Poetic anthologies can be roughly divided between those that include antique epigrams (*Classicizing Anthologies*) and those that consist solely of Byzantine material (*Byzantine Anthologies*).

The compilation that has primarily been associated with the word "anthology" is the so-called *Greek Anthology*. The term *Greek Anthology* refers to anthologies formed from / around the ninth-century Anthology of Constantine Kephala, and specifically to the poems in the tenth-century recension in the Palatine manuscript and the thirteenth-century *Anthology* of Maximos Planudes. Kephala – about whom we know almost nothing – published in the 880s, at the earliest, an anthology of Ancient and late antique poetry. His sources were mainly Alexandrian, Roman and late antique anthologies. To this antique material, Kephala himself added a small number of ninth-century

³⁶ Nos. 9 and 10 in Romano's edition are not included in the collection as appears in *Marcianus* and thus they could have been arranged within the suggested cluster of tomb-epigrams.

³⁷ See R. Romano, "Per una nuova edizione dei carmi di Nicola Callicle", *Vichiana* n.s. 5, 1976, pp. 87 – 101.

³⁸ The lack of significant differences in the readings of poems that are included both in the collection and were circulated independently does not support the existence of two separate manuscript traditions. See, e.g., the apparatus criticus in Romano's poem no. 18.

epigrams³⁹, but also a book with Christian epigrams at the very beginning of his collection to justify his use of pagan poetry⁴⁰.

The manuscript of Kephalas has not survived, but the tenth-century *Palatine Anthology* must be considered a faithful copy, but with the addition of three books⁴¹. The copying of the book was a collective work, but its final tenth-century form is the work of one scribe who was the final redactor of the manuscript⁴². A twelfth-century hand copied additional epigrams in the book⁴³.

The *Kephalas anthology* was an immediate success. Many copies, most of which do not survive, were redacted⁴⁴. Interestingly, none of them appears to be a faithful copy of the *Kephalas Anthology*, since in all cases a selection process was involved. The *Palatine Anthology* incorporated poems that were originally not to be found in the *Kephalas Anthology*. Another recension, the *Sylloge Euphemiana*, which was compiled during the reign of Leo VI (886 – 912), included only re-arranged selections from the *Kephalas Anthology*⁴⁵. The same holds true for the *Sylloge Parisina* that comes from an early abridgement of Kephalas⁴⁶.

The great thirteenth-century scholar, Maximos Planudes, organized a new enterprise to collect as much as possible from Kephalas' original anthology in between 1280 and 1283. He used two manuscripts that come from a different branch of Kephalas' manuscript tradition than the *Palatine Anthology*. He compared and compiled a new anthology, today named the *Anthologia Planudea*. In the *Anthologia Planudea* one can find no less than four hundred fifty additional epigrams to the 3,700 epigrams of the *Palatine Anthology*. Planudes, however, did not follow faithfully Kephalas thematic

³⁹ For Kephalas' additions of ninth century poetry see: Lauxtermann, "Cephalas", pp. 200–02.

⁴⁰ Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, pp. 89–98.

⁴¹ *Anthologia Palatina* books II, III and VIII. See Lauxtermann, "Janus Lascaris", pp. 63–65. See also Maltomini, "Poesia epigrammatica", pp. 113–20.

⁴² The first group of scribes worked between 920 and 930 (B¹, B², B³) and the second just a few years later, between 940 and 950 (A¹, A², J). The identification of J, the redactor of the manuscript, with Constantine the Rhodian has been disputed by Orsini, "Lo scriba J", but without good cause: see Lauxtermann, "Cephalas", p. 196, n. 5.

⁴³ Scribe Σ^π literature on this issue? Or is this your finding?.

⁴⁴ Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, 114.

⁴⁵ Maltomini, *Tradizione Antologica*, pp. 79–94; Cameron, *The Greek Anthology*, pp. 254–77.

⁴⁶ Maltomini, *Tradizione Antologica*, pp. 29–47; Cameron, *The Greek Anthology*, pp. 217–53; van Opstall, *Jean Géomètre*, pp. 99–102. Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, pp. 287–90.

categories; instead, he cut sequences into shorter blocks, mixed poems, and even re-arranged some epigrams.

Kephalas Anthology withstood the pace of time by being complete, organized and adaptive. Thus, its production is not the result of mere classicism⁴⁷; instead the effort of a genius, such as Kephalas, who managed to collect and justify more than 4,000 epigrams made unnecessary to compile *ex novo* a similar anthology in the subsequent years⁴⁸. Luckily, he lived in years with a great interest in the classics and late antiquity as examples of rhetorical production. Fortunately, Kephalas' time was only the prelude of an even greater interest in collecting and anthologizing and thus the anthology of Kephalas could receive the recognition that it deserved and its contents keep being copied. Thus, Byzantine "classism" was only a part of the equation that lead to the compilation of this (still) influential anthology.

The turbulent story of the Greek Anthology leads to one of the main points of this contribution: no two anthologies are the same. To my knowledge, there are no faithful copies of one anthology, since a factor of re-organizing is always involved. As soon as a scribe is engaged in copying, he becomes a new anthologist. The fluctuant nature of short texts allowed him to select those that he found interesting for his own reasons. With no need to abbreviate, the anthologist was able to quote the poems without affecting their individual character as snapshots from a larger composition. The titles were there to remind the reader of the individual character of each poem. *Byzantine anthologies* also fit into this "mix and [perhaps] match" pattern.

The elegant tenth-century manuscript Barberinus Gr. 310 contains one of the earliest surviving Byzantine anthologies – the so-called *Anthologia Barberina*⁴⁹. It was compiled contemporaneously to the copying of the manuscript and it is organized so as to flatter emperor Constantine VII⁵⁰. Although it has lost most of its pages, its index has

⁴⁷ For the reception of the *Anthologia Palatina* in the tenth and eleventh centuries see: Kr. Demoen, 'Flee from love who shoots with the bow! The *Anthologia Palatina* and the classical epigrammatic tradition in Byzantium', in J. Nelis (ed.), *Receptions of antiquity*, Gent 2012, pp. 57–67.

⁴⁸ On the arrangement of the poetry see above p. xxx, and Maltomini, "Poesia epigrammatica", pp. 120–23.

⁴⁹ C. Gallavotti, "Note su testi e scrittori di codici greci VII – XII", *RSBN* 24, 1987, pp. 29–83. C. Crimi, "Motivi e forme dell'anacreontea tardoantica e bizantina: una lettura delle due parti del Barberianus gr. 310", in M. Salvatore (ed.), *La poesia tardoantica e medievale*, Alessandria 2001, pp. 25–53. F. Ciccolella, *Cinque poeti bizantini: Anacreontee dal Barberiniano greco 310*, Alessandria 2000, pp. XXVIII – XXXIII. Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, pp. 123–28.

⁵⁰ Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, p. 126.

been preserved, offering a comprehensive picture of the poems' arrangement. The poems of the first part of the manuscript (mainly anacreontics) date from between the sixth and the ninth centuries and some of them can also be found in the Palatine manuscript⁵¹. Alphabets and various hymns that date from between the years 867 and 912 prevail in the second part. The *Anthologia Barberina* is the only Byzantine anthology that can be read as a songbook, as a collection of lyrics: both alphabets and anacreontics, written in accentual metre, were intended for musical performance⁵².

The anthology in the early twelfth-century manuscript Paris. Suppl. Gr. 690 may differ from the *Anthologia Barberina* as to its contents, but not its intended audience⁵³. The once luxurious manuscript – clearly written for a commissioner of high status – with titles in gold is today in deplorable condition and spare folia and significant *lacunae* make it impossible to discern the original arrangement of the poetry⁵⁴. However, the surviving material from the anthology points to Par. Suppl. Gr. 690 as the herald (or perhaps the only survivor) of a new pattern for anthologizing poetry. If Kephala was interested only in a small number of contemporary or nearly contemporary poet works, if the *Anthologia Barberina* is a songbook for the court, the anonymous anthologist of the Parisian manuscript is far from it. The manuscript itself includes some classical poetry, but the anthologist is concerned mainly with texts of Byzantine authors. Poets such as Pisides, Geometres, Mitylenaios, Mauropous, Psellos, but also Kosmas the Melode, have a place there. All these poems are laudatory poems, epigrams on works of art, and liturgical hymns, and can be viewed as “good poetry” from a time relatively close to the anthologist's past.

Medieval Greek anthology culture reached its peak within the context of the early Palaeologan “revival”. Manuscripts with Byzantine letters, homilies, and histories date primarily from this time of high hopes and scholarly confidence after the politically turbulent years following the dramatic events around the year 1204. The high level of scholarship in the early years of the Palaiologan dynasty encouraged the creation of compilations of literature surviving in the Constantinopolitan libraries after 1261, and

⁵¹ Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, pp. 126–27. M.L. West, *Carmina Anacreontica*, Leipzig 1984, pp. X–XI.

⁵² Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, pp. 127–28, where also comparison to the *Book of Ceremonies*.

⁵³ Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, pp. 329–33; Rochefort, “Une anthologie”; Bernard, *Reading and Writing*, pp. 72–73. The dating of the manuscript is heavily disputed; see Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, p. 329.

⁵⁴ Rochefort, “Une anthologie”, p. 4.

thus it is understandable that the late thirteenth- and early-fourteenth centuries are rich in poetic anthologies as well. Unfortunately, only a small number of them has been sufficiently studied and the role of Nicaea to the anthologizing impulse remains unexplored.

The most famous of all is the late thirteenth-century *Anthologia Marciana*. It was compiled in the last decades of the century in Constantinople and today can be found in the *Biblioteca Marciana* under the number Gr. 524 (collocation no. 318). The *Anthologia Marciana* is a *hyper-anthology* that includes long poems, such as Constantine Stilbes' nearly one thousand verses on the great fire of 1197; authored collections, such as those of Nicholas Kallikles and Theodore Balsamon; and three anonymous compilations of poetry ("Syllogae"). The "Syllogae" are relatively small anthologies with occasional poetry (epitaphs, epigrams on works of art, deme-hymns, etc). The first Sylloge, Sylloge A, consists of thirty-nine poems that date from mainly the eleventh century. Sylloge B, with a hundred seventy-three poems, is the largest of the three compilations. The datable poems come mainly from after the year 1140, with poetry from after 1050 interspersed. Sylloge C contains forty-five poems from between 1050 and 1200, some of which have been copied from previous parts of the same manuscript. The seemingly sloppy layout suggests that the scribe copied the anthology for his own use and he did not aspire to circulate the texts. In most probability the scribe is the redactor of the poetic anthology as it is transmitted in the manuscript Marcianus gr. 524. However, it is unclear whether he collected the poetry by himself or whether he "anthologized" from one or more pre-existing anthologies⁵⁵.

Another thirteenth-century anthology copied by the Scribe for his personal use is manuscript Hauniensis GkS 1889.4, in Copenhagen and apparently only a fragment from a larger anthology that has not survived⁵⁶. The datable poems come from the late eleventh

⁵⁵ On the *Anthologia Marciana* and the relevant bibliography see Spingou, "Anonymous Poets", pp. 139–140.

⁵⁶ For the poems see L.G. Westerink, *Michaelis Pselli Poemata*, Leipzig 1992, pp. VIII–IX. For the description of the manuscript see B. Schartau, *Codices Graeci Haunienses*, Copenhagen 1994, pp. 157–59. A new re-appraisal of the manuscript was published by Christensen, "Inedita". I follow here the dating implied as the most probable by Christensen.

century. Again, there is not a sense of order in this anthology, while it is uncertain if it is indeed the copy of a previous anthology⁵⁷.

Looking for general patterns in the compilation of the anthologies, scribes in these centuries were copying poetry for themselves and not necessarily for a wealthy commissioner. Such poetry could be used as model-text. Indeed a verse for the Sylloge A of the *Anthologia Marciana* can only be found in a thirteenth-century grammatical treatise as an example of concise but meaningful verse⁵⁸. Furthermore, the language of court poetry during the reigns of Michael VIII and Andronikos II resembles much the style of the poetry found in anthologies⁵⁹.

Similar was the use of the anthologies in the periphery. A number of manuscripts with poems comes from South Italy and especially the Terra d'Otranto where a Greek-speaking population had a pronounced presence with a number of functioning monasteries. In two prominent thirteenth and fourteenth-century manuscripts local poetic production is mixed with Byzantine poetry stemming from the center⁶⁰, suggesting that Italian poets used the poets as examples of good writing⁶¹. An early fourteenth-century manuscript from Cyprus appears to be a parallel case. The Vatican manuscript Palatinus gr. 367 contains a collection of mainly letters and charters from early Frankish Cyprus. The collected texts were meant to be used as models by local family notaries. Among the various prose works, it also includes enclaves with poetry. Poems from the Byzantine center are mixed with poems that notaries have written or received as gifts⁶².

The poetic anthologies did not disappear with the political turning point marked by the year 1453. The *Greek Anthology* was already a great success in the West.

⁵⁷ As suggested by Christensen, "Inedita", p. 320.

⁵⁸ Hörandner, "Pseudo-Gregorios", pp. 127–28.

⁵⁹ See the contribution of Martin Hinterberger in the present volume <PLEASE CHECK that he does mention this point>. No he doesn't mention anything about this issue. Delete this footnote!

⁶⁰ Laur. Plutei V. 10 (a. 1282) and Vat. gr. 1276 (XIV s.) see Arnesiano, *La minuscola*, no. 26 (pp. 80–81), no. 46 (p. 87), A.M. Bandini, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*, Florence 1764, pp. 23–30; J. N. Sola, "De codice Laurentiano X plutei V", *BZ* 20 (1911) 373 – 383; Bernard, *Reading and Writing*, pp. 73–74. See also Gigante, *Poeti Byzantini*, 19 – 20; see also J.M. Hoeck and R.J. Loenertz, *Nikolaos – Nektarios von Otranto Abt von Casole*, *Studia Patristica et Byzantina* 11, Ettal 1965, pp. 114–16. J.M. Acconcia-Longo, "Anthologia", cf. the case of Laur. Plut. 58.25, see Arnesiano, *La minuscola*, no. 54 (p. 89).

⁶¹ E.g. Gigante, *Poeti Bizantini*, pp. 20–23.

⁶² Fols. 122–148. Description in A. Beihammer, *Griechische Briefe und Urkunden aus dem Zypern der Kreuzfahrerzeit. Die Formularsammlung eines königlichen Sekretärs im Vaticanus Palatinus Graecus 367*, Zyprisches Forschungszentrum, Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte Zypers 57, Nicosia 2007, pp. 47–49. On the identity of compiler see *ibid.*, pp. 55–62, esp. pp. 58–59.

Although Byzantine Anthologies had fallen into oblivion, those initiated into Byzantine literature were compiling their own anthologies⁶³. It is sufficient to look at the notebooks of Andreas Darmarios (a sixteenth-century book dealer) and Leo Allatius (librarian of the Vatican Library) or at the anonymous nineteenth-century anthology of Byzantine-Italian poets in Palermo to be persuaded of the importance of the anthologizing impulse for the transmission of the Byzantine poetry in early modern times⁶⁴.

Authorship in Collections and Anthologies

If collections, as defined here, are built around the axis of authorship, anthologies show little concern with the delicate matter of who wrote what. Most often, particularly occasional poetry appears anonymously. One might mention the gargantuan *syllogae* in the *Anthologia Marciana*. Despite the fact that some poems in the *syllogae* come from the poetic collections of Christopher Mitylenaios and Nicholas Kallikles, they are quoted anonymously⁶⁵. In the anthology of ms. Hauniensis 1899, most poems appear unattributed or with false ascriptions⁶⁶. Furthermore, other poems often appear to be attributed to more than one poet. A poem by the tenth-century poet John Geometres appears in manuscripts either unattributed or with no less than five different ascriptions⁶⁷. Such multiple attributions have puzzled modern editors who are most concerned with authorship. Robert Romano, for example, in his edition of Nicholas Kallikles' poems, was led to consider a poem of 'uncertain authorship' (perhaps you mention here which poem this is), since a manuscript ascribed the poem to Theodore Prodromos, despite the fact that the

⁶³ Lauxtermann, "Ianus Laskaris".

⁶⁴ On Andreas Darmarios see for instance Monac. Gr. 162, a. 1579 (K. Hadjú, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München*, vol. 3, Wiesbaden 2003, pp. 271–73). On Leo Allatius (1586 – 1669) see for example Barb. Gr. 74, s. XVII (V. Capocci, *Codices Barberiniani Graeci*, vol. 1, codices 1–163, Vatican 1958, pp. 80–94). For the anonymous anthology see ms. Palermo Bibl. Communalis 2QqG40 (= Mioni 175), a. 1840.

⁶⁵ See Spingou, "The Anonymous Poets"; A. Rhoby, "Zur Identifizierung von bekannten Autoren im Codex Marcianus graecus 524," *Medioevo Greco* 10 (2010), 113–150.

⁶⁶ Westerink, *Michaelis Pselli Poemata*, p. VIII.

⁶⁷ Attributed to Psellos, Prosouch, Choniates, Prodromos, Philes, Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, p. 289. See also N. Patterson Ševčenko, "The metrical inscriptions", pp. 71–72.

poem was included in Kallikles' collection as well⁶⁸. Other philologists decided to not publish their editorial work on anthologies because they were unable to identify authors⁶⁹.

It is not by pure co-incidence that Byzantine compilers were not interested in accurately attributing texts. Despite the concern of some authors to safeguard their identity by compiling collections or giving hints in the main text⁷⁰, the concept of "copyright" *per se* is a modern invention. Epigrams, verses, rare or newly coined words, were used and re-used without giving any credit to their original creator. Manuel Straboromanos, a little known poet, wrote a series of epigrams on behalf of Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118) in which he incorporated an epigram by Michael Psellos without giving him credit⁷¹. Furthermore, epigrams on works of art, in particular, were inscribed and recycled and the name of the author did not figure under inscriptions. A famous example is an epigram by the tenth-century poet John Geometres that accompanies a twelfth-century depiction of the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste in Asinou⁷². Similar we see in the case of Straboromanos adopting Psellos' epigram and the epigraphist in Asinou using the work of an earlier poet, poems also have been included anonymously in collections or, to be more precise, anthologies were built around the work of a single poet. The little explored manuscript tradition of Manuel Philes poems testifies to such a habit.

When reading Philes, we rely mostly on the very problematic nineteenth-century edition by Bénigne Emmanuel Clément Miller⁷³. Miller arranged the poems according to what he considered "primary manuscripts". Even in the first pages of the printed book one could find a number of poems that are not penned by Philes, but they have been included among his poems. In most cases, these are epigrams on works of art, which, thanks to their formulaic language and to their utilitarian character as potential verse inscriptions, could circulate freely. The anthologist (or perhaps even Philes himself)

⁶⁸ The same poem (no. 32) appears also in Kallikles' collection. Romano, *Callicles*, p. 29

⁶⁹ On the unpublished edition of the anonymous *Sylogae* of the *Anthologia Marciana* by Konstantin Horna, see F. Spingou, "The vicissitudes of an anthology" (in preparation) Is already published?.

⁷⁰ See for example the use of the word "φῖλος" and its derivatives in the poetry of Philes.

⁷¹ Bernabò, M., and E. Magnelli, "Il codice Laurenziano Plut. 32.32 e l'iconografia bizantina dei carmina figurata," *Byzantinistica* 2nd series/13, 2011, p. 202.

⁷² N. Patterson Ševčenko, "The metrical inscriptions", p. 70–72.

⁷³ E. Miller, *Manuelis Philae Carmina*, 2 vols., Paris 1855 – 1857. For the latest criticism on Miller's edition see Stickler, *Manuel Philes*. Somewhere Lauxtermann states that Miller's edition is even for 19th c. standards poor.

thought it appropriate to include a further example on the same “subject” (a depiction), even if it was by a different author.

The practice of including poems by different authors in a collection is not unique to Byzantine poetic anthologies. Collections of letters also include mis-attributed texts⁷⁴. The reason behind these misattributions is the very function of a collection of rhetorical texts, as both letters and poems are. Theoretical rhetorical treatises and fictional model-texts dedicated to specific “genres” are rare in Byzantium. Anthologies and collections were filling this gap by offering examples of good writing. In a famous passage from the thirteenth-century treatise of Pseudo-Gregory of Corinth on rhetoric, the author appears to incite the reader to have as models George of Pisidia, Nicholas Kallikles, Prodromos “and whoever is similar to them”⁷⁵. Significantly, names mainly of these “canonical” authors appear in collections, while the names of many more poets (those whose existence we infer from other sources) are lost for good.

The question of authorship becomes relevant especially for texts aimed at the “spiritual benefit of the reader,” in which authorship ensures “orthodoxy”. Spiritual florilegia or anthologies, for instance, the thirteenth-century anthology by Mark the Monk, often include clusters with poetry. Short epigrams with obvious profit for the soul are not necessarily attributed, but excerpts from longer poems are attributed to church fathers such as John Chrysostom⁷⁶.

Collections, Anthologies and the Literary Canon

Anthologies and collections of Byzantine poetry incorporate principles related to the literary canon, for they presuppose a selection process on the basis of “value”. This selection appears to depend on the individual, given the diversity of the anthologies, and so compilations seem to represent a “private canon”, which was assembled on commission or speculation. The various canons, however, are built around the axis of common aesthetic values. The relatively narrow selection of poems they represent, although not always first-rate, nevertheless demonstrate one or more of the following

⁷⁴ See, e.g., Papaioannou, *Michael Psellos*, p. 265.

⁷⁵ Pseudo-Gregorios, *On the four parts of the perfect speech*, ed. W. Hörandner, “Pseudo-Gregorios”, p. 108.

⁷⁶ See Ph. Roelli, *Marci Monachi Opera Ascetica : Florilegium et sermones tres* (CCSG 72), Turnhout 2009, esp. pp. 66–67, 90–94 and 98–99.

characteristics: erudite and often purposely obscure language; newly coined compounds; rich list of modifiers; vivid metaphors and images; personal involvement; (acceptable) metrics; and/or rhythm. A possible demonstration of “Orthodox” values can be potentially added to this list. The sensibility towards these aesthetic values indicates that the collector, anthologist, and scribe were seen as the custodians of cultural capital. The names of famous, “canonical”, authors were there to signify that indeed a poem possesses these characteristics and thus deserves attention⁷⁷.

The great number of anthologies of occasional poetry dating from the second half of the thirteenth and the early fourteenth centuries and their decline in numbers after the 1330s are telling. In the early Palaeologan court but also in roughly contemporary South Italy and Cyprus, it was essential for the individual to write appropriate poetry that incorporated as many of the abovementioned aesthetic values originating from a glorious past as possible, or to understand the connotation of similar texts. With this skill, the reader could participate in mainstream culture. As soon as this social interest towards this kind of rhetoric ceased to exist because of sociopolitical changes, such a literature ceased to be important and, accordingly, was no longer intensively collected⁷⁸. Only later compilations were based on personal, isolated interests, such as the cases of Darmarios and Allatius in the 16th century demonstrate.

Concluding Remarks

The short nature of this essay precluded an overview of the collections with liturgical or vernacular poetry, not to mention *poetic miscellani* (codices only with poetry) and early modern anthologies of Byzantine poetry. From the material that has been surveyed here, three conclusion can be drawn. First, that the poems collected in an anthology or collection do not differ significantly from objects collected by, e.g., Sir Wellcome, and then exhibited in a collection. The selected texts create a new whole (a storyline), although they preserve their individuality. Second, our modern picture of Byzantine poetry passes through the lens of collectors and anthologists, who worked as the curators

⁷⁷ Papaioannou, “Voice, Signature, Mask”, pp. 35–39.

⁷⁸ On the decline of interest see D. Angelov, *Imperial Ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204 – 1330*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 7–8.

of an exhibition of poetry, since occasional poetry survives almost exclusively in collections and anthologies. Third, a collection or an anthology cannot be seen as an isolated cultural event, out of its sociocultural context. It is a cultural product of the concerns and the needs of a society at a specific time. John Mauropous and Isaac Komnenos collected their works at a time that education was connected to social status and the place of the individual was paramount. Kephalas and Dionysios worked at a time when aspects of the past were important for forming a new future. The multilayered *Greek Anthology* shows magnificently how such needs changed over time. Thus, each anthology or collection *reflects* only intentional in part but nevertheless significant choices between what should be remembered (and thus be preserved) or forgotten (and thus disappear). Such a function does not differ much from how one would describe “culture” itself.

Appendix I: Selected Collections of Byzantine Poetry (9th – 14th cent.)

9 th cent.	Ignatios the Deacon, <i>Epitaphs</i> (not preserved ⁷⁹) Theodore of Stoudios ⁸⁰ <i>Anonymous Italian</i> (Barocci 50 ⁸¹).
10 th cent.	<i>Anonymous Patrician</i> (Vat. Pal. Gr. 367, s. XIV inc.) <i>John Geometres</i> (Pal. Suppl. Gr. 352, s. XIII, ff. 151–79).
11 th cent.	Symeon the New Theologian (Marc. Gr. 494, s. XIII s.; Paris. Suppl. gr. 103, s. XIV; Patmiacus 427, s. XIV) <i>Anonymous of Sola</i> (Vat. gr. 753, f. 4 ^{r-v}) ⁸² . John Mauropous (Vat. gr. 676, s. XI) Christophoros Mitylenaios (Grott. <i>Bibl. Bad. Greca</i> Z a XXXIX, s. XIII)
12 th cent.	Nicholas Kallikles (Marc. Gr. 524, XIII s. ex.) Theodore Prodromos (Vat. gr. 305, XIII s. ex.) ‘Manganeios Prodromos’ (Marc. Gr. XI 22, XIV s.) Theodore Balsamon (Marc. Gr. 524 (XIII s. ex.)
13 th cent.	John Apokaukos (St Petersburg RNB Gr. 250 Granstrem 454) Maximos Planudes (Paris. suppl. gr. 1090, XV s. & Paris. gr. 1211)

⁷⁹ Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, pp. 111–12.

⁸⁰ See Speck, *Theodoros*, p. 59.

⁸¹ See R. Browning, “An unpublished corpus of Byzantine poems”, *Byzantium* 33, 1963, pp. 289–316 = *Studies on Byzantine History Literature and Education*, London 1977, no. VIII; for its Italian origin see Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, 325–26.

⁸² G. Sola, “Giambografi sconosciuti del secolo XI”, *Roma e l’Oriente* 11, 1916, pp. 18–27 and 149–153; cf. Lauxtermann, *Poetry*, pp. 327–28; Bernard, “The Anonymus of Sola”

Maximos/Manuel Holobolos

- 14th cent. Leo Bardales (Paris. gr. 1630)
Manuel Philes (although its textual transmission remains problematic, see Stickler, *Manuel Philes*, 209–242)
Nikephoros Kallistou Xanthopoulos (Ambros. G.50 sup., Martini-Bassi 395, XV/XVII s., ff. 35-37^v; Vindob. Theol. Gr. 78, f. XIV, ff. 360^v- 361^v).

Anthologies

For the manuscript tradition of the *Greek Anthology* see J. Irigoin, Fr. Maltomini and P. Laurens, *Anthologie grecque. Première partie. Anthologie Palatine. Tome IX. Livre X* (Paris, 2011).

Anthologies of Byzantine Poetry (preliminary list)

- Barber. Gr. 310 (X s.) = *Anthologia Barberina*
Vat. Gr. 753 (XI s.)
Paris. Suppl. gr. 690 (XII s.)
Laur. Plut. 5.10 (a. 1282), ff. 25–214
Haun. Gr. 1899 (XIII s.)
Marc. Gr. 524 (XIII s.) = *Anthologia Marciana*
Vat. Gr. 1357 (XIV s.)
Vat. Pal. Gr. 367 (a. 1317 – 1318)
Laur. Plut. 32.19 (XIV s.)
Bodl. Roe 18 (1349)
Scor. Gr. R.III.17 (XIV s.)
Vat. Gr. 1267 (XIV s.)
Vat. Ottob. 324 (XIV/XV s.)

Andreas Darmarios: Monanch. Gr. 162 (1579), Bodl. Auct. D. 3. 19 (Misc. 4, XVI s.)

Leo Allatius: Barber. Gr. 74 and 279 (XVII s.).

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Christopher Mitylenaios, *Verses*, ed. M. de Groote, *Versuum*.
John Mauropous, *Poems*, ed. P. de Lagarde, *Johannis Euchaitorum metropolitae Quae in codice vaticano graeco 676 supersunt*, Gottingen 1882, pp. 1–51.
Kallikles, *Poems*, ed. R. Romano, *Nicolaus Callicles*

Niketas Stethatos, *Vita*, ed. I. Hausherr and G. Horn, *Un grand mystique byzantin, vie de Syméon le Nouveau Théologien (949 – 1022) par Nicéas Stéthatos*, Orientalia Christiana 12 (Rome, 1928).

Theodore the Stoudite, *Iambs*, ed. P. Speck, *Theodoros*, pp. 110–309.

Secondary Literature

Arseno, D., *La minuscola “barocca” : Scritture e libri in Terra d’Otranto nei secoli XIII e XIV*, Fonti medievali e moderne XII, Salento 2007.

Bernard, F., “The Anonymus of Sola and the School of Nosiai”, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 61 (2011), pp. 81–88

Bernard, F., *Reading and Writing Byzantine Secular Poetry, 1025–1081*, Oxford Studies in Byzantium, Oxford 2014.

Cameron, Al., *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*, Oxford 1993.

Christensen, J., “Inedita from the (sic) MS. Hauniensis 1899”, *ByzSymm* 21 (2011), 339–49.

Crimi, C., *Cristoforo di Mitilene: Canzoniere*, Catania 1983.

de Groote, M., *Versuum variorum Collectio Cryptensis* (CCSG, 74,) Turnhout 2012.

Gallavotti, G., ‘Note su testi e scrittori di codici greci VII – XII’, *RSBN* 24 (1987) 29–83.

Gigante, M., *Poeti Byzantini di Terra d’Otranto nel secolo XIII*, Napoli 1979.

Greenfield, R., *Niketas Stethatos : The Life of Saint Symeon the New Theologian*, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library, Washington, D.C. 2013.

Hörandner, W., “Pseudo–Gregorios Korinthios: Über die vier Teile der perfekten Rede”, *Medioevo greco* 12 (2012), pp. 87–131.

Horna, K., “Die Epigramme des Theodoros Balsamon”, *Wiener Studien* 25 (1903) 165–217.

Kambylis, A., *Symeon Neos Theologos: Hymnen*, Supplementa Byzantina 3, Berlin/New York 1976.

Koder, J., “Ο Συμεών ο Νέος Θεολόγος και οι ύμνοι του”, in Ath. Markopoulos, ed., *Τέσσερα κείμενα για την ποίηση του Συμεών του Νέου Θεολόγου*, Athens 2008, pp. 1–35.

---, *Syméon le Nouveau Théologien, Hymnes*, vol. 1, Sources Chétiennes 156, Paris 1968.

Kominis, Ath., *Τὸ βυζαντινὸν ἱερὸν ἐπίγραμμα καὶ οἱ ἐπιγραμματικοί*, Ἀθηνᾶ : Σειρά Διατριβῶν καὶ Μελετημάτων 3, Athens 1966.

Lauxtermann, M., “Janus Lascaris and the Greek Anthology”, in S. de Beer *et al.* (eds.), *The Neo-Latin Epigram : A Learned and Witty Genre*, Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia 25, Leuven 2009, 41–65.

---, “The Anthology of Cephalas”, in M. Hinterberger and E. Schiffer, eds., *Byzantinische Sprachkunst. Studien zur byzantinischen Literatur gewidmet Wolfram Hörandner*

- zum 65. Geburtstag, *Byzantinisches Archiv* 20, Berlin/New York, 2007, pp. 194–208.
- , *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres*, Wiener Byzantinistische Studien XXIV/1, Vienna 2003.
- Magdalino, P., “Orthodoxy and history in tenth-century Byzantine ‘encyclopedism’”, in Van Deun and C. Macé, eds., *Encyclopedic trends*, pp. 143–159.
- Maltomini, Fr., “Selezione e organizzazione della poesia epigrammatica fra IX e X secolo – la perduta antologia di Constantino Cefala e l’*Antologia Palatina*”, in P. Van Deun and C. Macé, eds., *Encyclopedic trends*, pp. 109–124.
- , *Tradizione Antologica dell’epigramma Greco: le sillogi minori di età bizantina e umanistica*, Pleiadi 9, Rome 2008.
- Odorico, P., ‘Cadre d’exposition/cadre de pensée’, in Van Deun and C. Macé, eds., *Encyclopedic trends*, pp. 89–107.
- , ‘La cultura della Sylloge’, *BZ* 83 (1990), pp. 1–21.
- Orsini, P. Orsini, “Lo scriba J dell’*Anthologia Palatina* e Constantino Rhodio”, *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* n.s. 54 (2000), pp. 425–35.
- Patterson Ševčenko, N., “The Metrical Inscriptions in the Murals of the Panagia Phorbiotissa” in A. Weyl Carr and A. Nicolaïdès, *Asinou Across Time : Studies in the Architecture and Murals of the Panagia Phorbiotissa, Cyprus*, Dumbarton Oaks Studies 43, Washington D.C., 2012,
- Papaioannou, Str., “Voice, Signature, Mask : The Byzantine Author”, in Pizzzone, ed., *The Author*, p. 21–40.
- , *Michael Psellos : Rhetoric and Authorship in Byzantium*, Cambridge 2013.
- Pizzzone, A., ed., *The Author in Middle Byzantine Literature: Modes, Functions, and Identities*, *Byzantinisches Archiv* 28, Boston/Berlin 2014.
- Rocheftort, G., “Une anthologie grecque du XI siècle : le Parisinus Suppl. gr. 690”, *Scriptorium* 4 (1950) 3–17.
- Romano, R., *Nicolaus Callicles : Carmi*, *Byzantina et Neo-Hellenica Neopolitana* 8, Napoli 1980.
- Speck, P., *Theodoros Studites : Jamben*, (Supplementa Byzantina, 1), Berlin 1968.
- Spingou, F., “The anonymous poets of the *Anthologia Marciana*: Questions of Collection and Authorship”, in Pizzzone, ed., *The Author*, p. 139–53.
- Stickler, G., *Manuel Philes und seine Psalmenmetaphrase*, Dissertationen der Universität Wien 229, Vienna 1992.
- Van Deun, P., and C. Macé, eds., *Encyclopedic trends in Byzantium? Proceedings of the international conference held in Leuven, 6–8 May 2009*, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 212, Leuven 2011.
- van Opstall, E., *Jean Géomètre: Poèmes en hexamètres et en distiques élégiaques. Edition, traduction, commentaire*, *The Medieval Mediterranean* 75, Leiden/Boston 2008.